Orchard, A.E., George, A.S. & Brummitt, R.K., (2007) Australian Plant Census precursor papers 1: Publication and lectotypification of the name *Stenocarpus simuatus* (Proteaceae). J. Adelaide Bot. Gard. 21: 85–87.

Different Australian herbarium house journals may be used for publication of the series from time to time, depending on publication schedules.

### Acknowledgements

Apart from acknowledging the hard work contributed by the State-based members of Working Group, CHAH, and the Information Management Group (listed in the table above) I would like to place on record my sincere thanks to all those other colleagues who have contributed data and encouragement to this project. To date the census has truly been a national effort, and one which demonstrates the collegiality of Australian plant taxonomy, and it shows every sign of continuing thus. In particular I wish to thank Bill Barker and Jim Croft, both for keeping me focused on the project, and for very useful suggestions to improve this overview.

### References

Australian National Herbarium et al. (2004). Australian Plant Names Index. Viewed in July 2006 <www.anbg.gov.au/ cpbr/databases/apni.html>.

- Barrett, G., A. Silcocks, S. Barry, R. Cunningham & R. Poulter (2003). *The New Atlas of Australian Birds*. (CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood)
- Council of Heads of Australasian Herbaria (2006). Australian Plant Census. A database of plant names for Australia. Viewed in October 2006 on < http://www.chah.gov.au/ chah/apc/index.html>.
- Hnatiuk, R.J. (1990). Census of Australian Vascular Plants. (Australian Flora & Fauna Series Number 11. AGPS Press, Canberra).
- Mueller, F. von (1882). Systematic Census of Australian Plants. (Victorian Government Printer, Melbourne).
- Mueller, F. von (1889). Second Systematic Census of Australian Plants. (Victorian Government Printer, Melbourne).
- Orchard, A.E. (2005a). Consensus Census Report. June 2005 Report. Austral. Syst. Bot. Soc. Newslett. 123: 25–27.
- Orchard, A.E. (2005b). CHAH Business. The Australian Plant Census. Austral. Syst. Bot. Soc. Newslett. 124: 16–17.
- Orchard, A.E. (2005c). CHAH Business. Australian Plant Census. Austral. Syst. Bot. Soc. Newslett. 125: 15–16.
- Orchard, A.E. (2006a). CHAH Business. Australian Plant Census. Austral. Syst. Bot. Soc. Newslett. 126: 30–31.
- Orchard, A.E. (2006b). CHAH Business. Australian Plant Census. Austral. Syst. Bot. Soc. Newslett. 127: 16–17.
- West, J. (2005). The Consensus Census: The List of Agreed Australian Vascular Plant Names. *Austral. Syst. Bot. Soc. Newslett.* 122: 10.

# Publication and lectotypification of the name Stenocarpus sinuatus (Proteaceae)

A.E. Orchard<sup>a</sup>, A.S. George<sup>b</sup> & R.K. Brummitt<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Australian National Herbarium, Centre for Plant Biodiversity Research, G.P.O. Box 1600, Canberra ACT 2601<sup>2</sup>

<sup>b</sup>'Four Gables', 18 Barclay Rd, Kardinya WA 6163

'Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AB, England, UK

The Firewheel Tree or Yiel-yiel is well known in cultivation and as a street tree, and admired for both its glossy dark green foliage and its spectacular radiating umbels of red and yellow flowers.

Most recent references (e.g. Foreman 1995; Henderson 2002) give its name as *Stenocarpus sinuatus* (Loudon) Endl., following Chapman (1991). Exceptionally Stanley & Ross (1986) and Harden (2002) cite the name as *Stenocarpus sinuatus* Endl.

The species epithet was first published by Loudon (1832), who utilised an Allan Cunningham manuscript name 'Agnostus sinuatus' in a list of plants growing

<sup>2</sup> Now P.O. Box 3427, Weston Creek ACT 2611

in England. Loudon pointed out that Cunningham's generic name meant "unknown; provisional name". However, Loudon accepted it, so it was not a nomen provisorium, but he did not provide a validating description. In the table of properties accompanying the list were symbols meaning "Evergreen tree", "15 feet", "ornamental" and "greenhouse". The tabular format of Loudon's publication is comparable with that of Sweet's *Hortus Britannicus* which is ruled in Ex. 3 of Art. 32 as not providing validating descriptions. The genericospecific combination is thus a nomen nudum and invalidly published. There was a note accompanying

Australian Plant Census Precursor Papers 1

Loudon's listing of 'Agnostus sinuatus': "This is the plant compared to an oak in the late notice of *Kew Garden, Gard. mag.* vol. vii p.687". This note does not provide a validating description, for two reasons. Firstly, the note referred to, in discussing Cunningham's collections, merely states "...another which may turn out a Quercus." Secondly, the last sentence of Art. 42.1 precludes using an earlier description or diagnosis to validate a descriptio generico-specifica.

So when was Stenocarpus sinuatus validated? In 1830 Brown described a quite different plant as Stenocarpus cunninghamii R.Br., and this name is still applied to a plant of Western Australia and the Northern Territory. Hooker (1846) described another plant as Stenocarpus cunninghamii Hook. and gave Agnostus sinuatus as a synonym. So Agnostus sinuatus was still invalid in this publication (Art. 34.1 (a)) and Stenocarpus cunninghamii Hook. was illegitimate (Art. 53.1). Endlicher (1848) accepted the name Stenocarpus sinuatus and referred back to Hooker's description of Stenocarpus cunninghamii Hook. Thus Stenocarpus sinuatus is validated in Endlicher and its type must be that on which Hooker based his description. Hooker mentioned several specimens on which his description was based, and also provided a diagnostic plate. A lectotype should be chosen from among these. The correct citation of the name of this species is Stenocarpus sinuatus Endl. (1848).

## Lectotypification

Hooker (1846) was very specific about the sources of his material. It had its origin in plants collected by Allan Cunningham in 1828 along the Brisbane River, Moreton Bay. These specimens were sterile and Cunningham was not sure what they were. He sent two rooted plants to England to "Mr Smith" who propagated a number of others from them. He also sent dried material to Robert Heward. In the meantime "T.Bidwill" [?J.C.Bidwill] had sent fruits (without seeds) to Hooker in 1843, and these were shown to Cunningham, who determined them as Stenocarpus. In August 1847 Hooker received from Messrs. Weeks and Day, from the greenhouse of the 'United Gardeners' Society', King's Road, Chelsea 'fine flowering specimens'. From these the plate in the Botanical Magazine was prepared, and the extensive validating description. Hooker noted that while the paper was in press he heard of additional flowering specimens in Edinburgh Botanic Garden (specimen received per Dr. Balfour) and at the Birmingham Botanic Garden per Mr Cameron (no specimen mentioned). Neither of these last two can be considered as providing potential syntypes, as they were received after preparation of the description.

As Cunningham's collections are sterile, and because Hooker described flowers and fruits, they are not ideal choices as lectotypes. Hooker's description is fulsome on flower characters, and thus the Weeks and Day specimen is the prime candidate for lectotype. Hooker also described the fruit, obviously on the evidence of the Bidwill collection, and this should also be considered a syntype.

Only one specimen derived from cultivated material survives in Hooker's Herbarium in Kew. It is flowering, and bears the following annotations: 'Cult.' 'S.sinuatus Endl. V. 539', with a printed label 'FLORA AUSTRALIENSIS named by Mr. Bentham.', another 'S. sinuatus Endl.! Stenocarpus Cunninghamii Hook. non Br. Bot. Mag. tab. 4263 1847 t.7', a faint pencil annotation that seems to read 'Fl. des Serres' [ie referring to a dry glasshouse], and a 'Herbarium Hookerianum' stamp. This specimen is here designated as lectotype of *Stenocarpus sinuatus* Endl.

Two Cunningham collections from Moreton Bay survive, both sterile, and these should be considered to be residual syntypes. One is in Kew Herbarium (K), one in the Natural History Museum (BM).

The Kew specimen is annotated '5. Stenocarpus sinuatus Endl. D.C.XIX 451 Stenocarpus Cunninghamii Hook. Bot. Mag. t. 4263 (non R.Br.) Agnostus sinuatus A.Cunn. Brisbane River Moreton Bay New Holland A.Cunningham 193/1828' plus a printed label 'ALLAN CUNNINGHAM'S AUSTRALIAN HERBARIUM Presented by Robert Heward Esq. 1862'.

The BM collection (cited by Foreman 1995) is annotated 'Moreton Bay' and lacks a collector, but is thought to be an Allan Cunningham collection.

No Bidwill material has been located.

The synonymy, formally, is:

#### Stenocarpus sinuatus Endl.

- Genera Plantarum, Suppl. 4(2): 88 (1848). Typus: "Allan Cunningham, banks of the Brisbane River, Moreton Bay, 1828; T. Bidwill Esq., loc. cit., 1843 [fruits]; Weeks & Day, United Gardeners Society, Kings Rd, Chelsea, August 1847 [cultivated specimen]; Dr Balfour, Edinburgh Botanic Garden, 1848 [cultivated specimen].' Lectotypus (designated here): Anon. [? Weeks & Day] s.n., s. dat., Cultivated (London) "S. sinuatus Endl. V. 539, Flora Australiensis named by Mr Bentham, S. sinuatus Endl.! Stenocarpus Cunninghamii Hook. non Br. Bot. Mag. tab. 4263 1847 t.7, Herbarium Hookerianum", K! Residual syntypi: A. Cunningham 193, 1828, Brisbane River, Moreton Bay, New Holland "5. Stenocarpus sinuatus Endl. D.C.XIX 451 Stenocarpus Cunninghamii Hook. Bot. Mag. t. 4263 (non R.Br.) Agnostus sinuatus A.Cunn. ALLAN CUNNINGHAM'S AUSTRALIAN HERBARIUM Presented by Robert Heward Esq. 1862" K!; Anon. [?Allan Cunningham], s.dat., Moreton Bay, BM (fide Foreman, 1995, n.v.).
- Agnostus sinuata Loudon, Hort. Brit. Suppl.1: 580 (1832), nom. nud., nom. inval.
- Cybele sinuata (Loudon) Kuntze, Revis. Gen. Pl. 2: 578 (1891)
- Stenocarpus cunninghamii Hook., Bot. Mag.: t. 4263 (1846), (as cunninghami), nom. illeg.
- Stenocarpus sinuosus F.Muell., Fragm. 5: 154 (1866), nom. nud., nom. inval.
- Stenocarpus sinuosus var. integrifolius F.Muell., Fragm. 5: 154 (1866) nom. nud., nom. inval., (as integrifolia)

## J. Adelaide Bot. Gard. 21 (2007)

Australian Plant Census Precursor Papers 1

It is worth noting that Chapman (1991) in listing many of these names, inadvertently attributed to Mueller (1866) two combinations that were never actually made, "Stenocarpus sinuosus F.Muell. var. latifolium F.Muell." and "S. sinuosus var. sectus F.Muell." Mueller actually described these taxa as varieties of S. moorei F.Muell., which is now considered synonymous with S. salignus R.Br. The Chapman combinations are at best invalid, not accepted by the author (he stated in the Introduction, p.Xii, to the Australian Plant Name Index that he did not intend to make any formal nomenclatural actions). They are probably best treated as orthographic variants.

## References

Brown, R. (1830). Supplementum Primum Prodromi Florae Novae Hollandiae. Richard Taylor, London.

- Endlicher, S.F.L. (1848). *Genera Plantarum, Suppl.* 4(2): 88. Friedrich Beck, Wien.
- Foreman, D.B. (1995). Stenocarpus, in A.E.Orchard & P.McCarthy (eds) Flora of Australia 16: 363–369. ABRS, Canberra & CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne.
- Harden, G.J. (2002). Stenocarpus, in G.J.Harden (ed.) Flora of New South Wales 2: 27 (Rev. edn). Royal Botanic Gardens, Sydney.
- Henderson, R.J.F. (2002). Names and Distribution of Queensland Plants, Algae and Lichens. Queensland Herbarium, Brisbane.
- Hooker, W. (1846). Stenocarpus cunninghamii, *Botanical Magazine* 72: t. 4263.
- Loudon, J.C. (1832). *Hortus Britannicus edn 2, Suppl.* 1: 580. Longman et al., London
- Mueller, F. (1866). [untitled], Fragmenta Phytographiae Australiae 5: 154 (1866). J. Ferres, Melbourne.
- Stanley, T.D. & Ross, E.M. (1986). Flora of South-eastern Queensland 2: 12–13. Queensland Department of Primary Industries, Brisbane.

# What is the gender of Sphenotoma (Epacridaceae)?

## A.E. Orchard

Australian National Herbarium, Centre for Plant Biodiversity Research, G.P.O. Box 1600, Canberra ACT 2601<sup>3</sup>

The generic name *Sphenotoma* for a genus of 6–7 Western Australian Epacridaceae has been variously treated as feminine or neuter by different authors. The name was derived from two Greek words : *spheno* (m.) to connect or bind together, and *tomos* (m.) a slice or section. The gender of the compound word is fixed by the final part. So notionally the name is masculine. In Latin, *tomus* (book, volume, from the same root) is also masculine. So on the face of it, the generic name *Sphenotoma* should be masculine.

However the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (Art. 62.1) states that gender of generic names is assigned by botanical tradition. That is, if the original author assigned the wrong gender and everyone followed him, then that overrides classical usage. What happened with *Sphenotoma*?

Sweet (1828) described only a single species *S. gracilis.* What does that say about the gender he was assigning? Unfortunately 'gracilis' is a Group B adjective (Stearn 1992)) and the ending can signify either masculine or feminine gender, but not neuter (which would be *S. gracile*).

What did later authors do?

- Lindley (1832) made the combination *S. capitatum* (neuter)
- Don (1834) made the combination S. squarrosa (feminine)
- Sonder (1845) made the combination *S. dracophylloides* (masculine, femine or neuter)
- Mueller (1883) made the combination *S. drummondii* (genitive, not relevant) and the combination *S. parviflorum* (neuter)
- Bentham (1869) put *Sphenotoma* in synonymy under *Dracophyllum* but gave the synonymous names neuter endings.
- Jackes (1970) and Newbey (1970) both treated it as neuter.
- Recent Western Australian checklists and censuses have treated *Sphenostoma* as neuter (see for example, Green, 1985; Paczkowska & Chapman, 2000); FloraBase website)
- APNI (Australian National Herbarium et al. 2004) treats the names as feminine (except 116631 *Sphenotoma gracile* (n.) which was taken from a WA source), following Arthur Chapman (1991).
- Watson & Dallwitz (2005) use the name *Sphenotoma* gracile, i.e., neuter.

Chapman, A.D. (1991). Australian Plant Name Index A–C, p. xii, & Q–Z, p. 2728. AGPS, Canberra.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Now P.O. Box 3427, Weston Creek ACT 2611